



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/598,836	09/13/2006	Daniel Willem Elisabeth Schobben	NLO40272	1011
24737 7590 09/28/2009 PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510				
EXAMINER XIAO, KE				
ART UNIT 2629		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 09/28/2009		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/598,836

Applicant(s)

SCHOBHEN ET AL.

Examiner

Ke Xiao

Art Unit

2629

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 June 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 8-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 8-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/5508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 8-10, 12 and 14-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki (US 2002/0079512) in view of Ikeda (US 2001/0020939).

Regarding **Claims 1 and 16**, Yamazaki teaches a scanning display apparatus and method of operation (Yamazaki, Fig. 1 scanning display) comprising:

(a) a display operable:

(i) to receive one or more driver signals and generate corresponding visual information for presentation on the display (Yamazaki, Fig. 1 display portions receive driver signals and generate images); and

(ii) to sense radiation received at the display and generate one or more sensing signals corresponding to a region proximate to the display (Yamazaki, Fig. 1 sensing portion senses radiation from pen); and

(b) computer hardware coupled to the display for generated the one or more driver signals for the display and for receiving the one or more sensing signals from the display (Yamazaki, Fig. 1 source and gate drivers), the computer hardware being

operable to provide an interactive use interface at the display (Yamazaki, Figs. 15A-B and 21A-B);

Yamazaki fails to teach that the apparatus is configured to sense objects and adapt the visual information of the display as claimed.

Ikeda teaches an apparatus which is configured to sense one or more objects when placed on or positioned in proximity to the display and obscuring at least part of the visual information displayed on the display (Ikeda, Figs. 35-38, sliding body blocks part of the display), and to adapt the visual information for display on the unobscured parts of the display which are unobscured by the one or more objects (Ikeda, Figs. 35-38, display is adapted to show visual information in unobscured area).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the de-energizing feature of Ikeda to the display device of Yamazaki in order to reduce power consumption.

Regarding **Claims 3 and 17**, Yamazaki further teaches that the display is operable to generate light radiation for illuminating the one or more objects placed in proximity to or on the display (Yamazaki, paragraph [0053]) and also for receiving at least part of the light radiation reflected from the one or more objects so as to enable the apparatus to assimilate a scanned image of the one or more objects (Yamazaki, paragraph [0053]).

Regarding **Claim 4**, Yamazaki further teaches that the computer hardware is operable to execute a first coarser scan to determine spatial location of the one or more

objects on or in proximity to the display, and then execute a finer scan to assimilate finer details of the one or more objects (Yamazaki, paragraph [0291]).

Regarding **Claim 8**, Yamazaki in view of Ikeda further teaches presenting the user interface in squeezed format when an unobscured active region of the display is insufficiently large to include all of the user interface (Ikeda Figs. 35-38).

Regarding **Claim 9**, Yamazaki in view of Ikeda further teaches that the user interface includes a scrolling feature for use in accessing squeezed parts of the user interface presented on the display (Ikeda, Fig. 36A-B directional buttons).

Regarding **Claim 10**, Yamazaki in view of Ikeda further teaches a minimum display size limit for the user interface is defined in the computer hardware such that obscuring more of the display than defined by the display size limit causes the computer hardware to present at least part of the user interface in a squeezed format (Ikeda Figs. 35-38 limit is 100% revealed. If less than 100% revealed then display a squeezed portion of the display).

Regarding **Claim 12**, Yamazaki further teaches that the computer hardware in conjunction with the display is operable to identify one or more objects in proximity to or in contact with the display and invoke one or more corresponding software application for executing in the computer hardware in response to placement of the one or more objects (Yamazaki, paragraph [0178]).

Regarding **Claim 14**, Yamazaki further teaches wherein the display comprises one or more pixel devices capable of both:

(a) generating or transmitting illumination (Yamazaki, Fig. 1 display portion transmits light); and

(b) sensing illuminating incident thereupon (Yamazaki, Fig. 1 sensing portion senses radiation from pen), the one or more pixel devices being fabricated using one or more of:

(c) liquid crystal display device with associated TFTs configured to function as a light sensor (Yamazaki, paragraph [0034-0035]).

Regarding **Claim 15**, Yamazaki further teaches the display apparatus of claim 1 adapted for using in computer monitors (Yamazaki, paragraph [0391]).

Regarding **Claim 18**, Yamazaki in view of Ikeda fails to teach wherein the visual information is adapted so that all the visual information are displayed on the unobscured parts. However the examiner takes official notice that it is well known in the art at the time of the invention to shift text around so that text can be rearranged on the display screen according to the shape and size of the screen so that all of the information can be displayed. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to allow all of the information to be displayed in order to better utilize the full extend of the unobscured area of Yamazaki in view of Ikeda (Ikeda, Figs. 36A, 36B).

Regarding **Claim 19**, Yamazaki in view of Ikeda inherently teaches wherein the computer hardware is configured to form a halo surrounding a footprint of the one or more objects to provide an indication of sensing the one or more object, and wherein the computer hardware is configured to removed the halo upon removal of the one or more objects from the proximity of the display (Ikeda, Figs. 36A and 36B, specifically

since half the display is turned off the edge of the top half of the display is turned on can be considered a halo for the purposes of the claimed invention, as can be seen from the applicant's own disclosure, the halo need not completely surround the object, only bordering the object).

Regarding **Claim 20**, Yamazaki in view of Ikeda further teaches wherein the computer hardware is configured to perform a coarse scan using ambient illumination to identify position of the one or more objects (Yamazaki, Fig. 1 sensor elements, and Ikeda Fig. 36) a fine scan, which is finer than the coarse scan, to identify details of the one or more objects using illumination generated by the display (Yamazaki, Fig. 1 sensor elements, paragraph [0291]).

Regarding **Claim 21**, Yamazaki further teaches wherein the computer hardware is configured to determine an identity of a user from detection of the one or more objects, and to present preferred visual information preferred by the user (Yamazaki, Fig. 21A paragraphs [0397-400]).

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki (US 2002/0079512) in view of Ikeda (US 2001/0020939) as applied to Claims 1, 3, 4, 8-10, 12, 14-21 above, and further in view of Baur (US 5,610,629).

Regarding **Claim 2**, Yamazaki further teaches the apparatus being arranged to identify positions of the one or more objects placed in proximity of the display by way of input device illumination to the apparatus obscured by the one or more objects (Yamazaki, Fig. 1 sensing portions).

Yamazaki in view of Ikeda fails to teach obscured *ambient* illumination as claimed. Baur teaches identifying position of one or more objects placed in proximity of the display by way of ambient illumination to the apparatus obscured by one or more objects (Baur, Col. 4 lines 20-28).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Yamazaki and Ikeda's display to identify positions using ambient illumination as well as input device illumination, as taught by Baur, in order to provide a more energy efficient mode of touch detection.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki (US 2002/0079512) in view of Ikeda (US 2001/0020939) as applied to Claims 1, 3, 4, 8-10, 12, 14-21 above, and further in view of Yamamoto (US 5,742,279).

Regarding **Claim 5**, Yamazaki in view of Ikeda fails to teach that the computer hardware is operable to present a representation of the one or more objects in a region of the display in which the one or more objects were placed during scanning as confirmation of successful completed scanning.

Yamamoto teaches computer hardware operable to present a representation of the one or more objects in a region of the display in which the one or more objects were placed during scanning as confirmation of successful completed scanning (Yamamoto, Col. 2 lines 15-22).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the presentation system of Yamamoto to the display system of

Yamazaki in view of Ikeda in order to provide active feedback to the user as it relates to scanning.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki (US 2002/0079512) in view of Ikeda (US 2001/0020939) as applied to Claims 1, 3, 4, 8-10, 12, 14-21 above, and further in view of Lane (US 5,623,344).

Regarding **Claim 11**, Yamazaki teaches a scanning display apparatus and method of operation (Yamazaki, Fig. 1 scanning display) comprising:

(a) a display operable:

(i) to receive one or more driver signals and generate corresponding visual information for presentation on the display (Yamazaki, Fig. 1 display portions receive driver signals and generate images); and

(ii) to sense radiation received at the display and generate one or more sensing signals corresponding to a region proximate to the display (Yamazaki, Fig. 1 sensing portion senses radiation from pen); and

(b) computer hardware coupled to the display for generated the one or more driver signals for the display and for receiving the one or more sensing signals from the display (Yamazaki, Fig. 1 source and gate drivers), the computer hardware being operable to provide an interactive use interface at the display (Yamazaki, Figs. 15A-B and 21A-B);

the apparatus being arranged to present the user interface comprising a plurality of user interface features (Yamazaki, Fig. 15A-B, 21A-B).

Yamazaki fails to teach that the computer hardware is provided with a priority identifier for each of the features for determining which of the features to omit from the presentation in the user interface in a situation where at least part of the display is obscured.

Ikeda teach computer hardware provided with an identifier for parts of the display screen including certain sections of the GUI for determining which of the sections to omit from the presentation in the user interface in a situation where at least part of the display is obscured (Ikeda, Figs. 35-38).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the omitting feature of Ikeda to the display device of Yamazaki in order to reduce power consumption.

Yamazaki in view of Ikeda fails to teach a priority identifier for each of the features as claimed.

Lane teaches using a priority identifier for each of the features for determining which features to omit from the presentation in the user interface in a situation where at least part of the GUI is cropped (Lane, Col. 30 lines 5-17).

It would have been obvious to add the priority identifier to the display system of Yamazaki as modified by Ikeda in order to allow for prioritized cropping of the graphical user interface as taught by Lane in order to provide the most important user interface items to the user when there is limited space on the display screen.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki (US 2002/0079512) in view of Ikeda (US 2001/0020939) as applied to Claims 1, 3, 4, 8-10, 12, 14-21 above, and further in view of Macinnes (WO 00/75766).

Regarding **Claim 13**, Yamazaki in view of Ikeda fails to teach animated icons as claimed. Macinnes teaches one or more software application are operable to generate one or more animated icons on the display which appear in surrounding spatial proximity to the one or more objects placed on the display, whereby providing a visual acknowledgement that the computer hardware has identified presence of the one or more objects (Macinnes, Fig. 5).

It would have been obvious to add the animated icons as taught by Macinnes to the display system of Yamazaki in view of Ikeda in order to provide active visual feedback to the user when and input is made thus avoiding accidental selection of an undesired selectable option (Macinnes, pg. 3 last paragraph).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed June 30th 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding **Claims 1 and 16**, the applicant argues that the claim is referring to the "very same" visual information. The examiner does not contend this fact. However claims 1 and 16 fail to limit the extent to which this very same visual information is displayed. Therefore the cited figures where only part of the visual information is displayed satisfies the claim language in that part of the visual information is blocked

and the other part of the visual information is displayed by the remainder of the screen. To further justify this rejection, the applicant makes this distinction quite clear in the newly added claim 18, where the examiner introduces new grounds of rejection.

Regarding **Claim 11**, the applicant argues that Lane fails to teach that the prioritization determines which area is being cropped, and it is actually the other way around. The examiner respectfully disagrees, the state machine defining the trick play section is the ultimate determining factor, however the prioritization indeed determines which sections are being cropped *on the display*, the cropping of the picture prior to the display is before the display during packet transmission, however the cropped displayed image is done afterwards. Therefore the rejection is maintained.

Regarding **Claims 4**, the applicant argues that there is no mention of coarse and fine scan as claimed. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Yamazaki clearly states that light is irradiated intermittently to the pen tip of the input pen from the pixel in the vicinity of the location indicated by the pen tip. This is the coarse reading, because only pixel in the vicinity but there is no indication of the exact pixel, however the fine reading is the actual reflection of the light from the pen back to the pixel which in turn defines the position of the pen.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ke Xiao whose telephone number is (571)272-7776. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30AM to 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sumati Lefkowitz can be reached on (571) 272-3638. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sumati Lefkowitz/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629

/Ke Xiao/
Examiner, Art Unit 2629